

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. In the Final Office Action mailed November 1, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner next rejected claims 1, 5-9, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Moore (USP 4,181,858). Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Toth (USP 5,457,724). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore and Toth as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Katsumata et al. (USP 4,558,458). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hsieh (USP 5,696,807). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lienard et al. (US Pub. 2003/0007603). Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Saunders (USP 4,896,343). Claims 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toth in view of Horiuchi (US Pub. 2002/0037067). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toth and Horiuchi as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Moore and Sembriski (US Pub. 2003/0058994). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toth and Horiuchi as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hsieh. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toth and Horiuchi as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Zhou et al. (US Pub. 2002/0094064) and Grass et al. (USP 4,578,806). Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toth, Horiuchi, Zhou et al, and Grass et al. as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Kendrick et al. (US Pub. 2003/0206614). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toth and Horiuchi as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Moore. Claims 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Horiuchi. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore and Horiuchi as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view

of Mattson (USP 5,228,070). Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore and Horiuchi as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Edholm et al (USP 3,755,672). Claims 4 and 21 are objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 4 and 21 to place the application in better condition for appeal.

Applicant has enclosed replacement sheets for Figs. 14 and 15 with improved contrast.

Applicant is filing a Notice of Appeal under separate cover.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's entry of these Amendments and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Mark Wilkinson/

J. Mark Wilkinson
Registration No. 48,865
Direct Dial 262-376-5016
jmw@zpspatents.com

Dated: February 1, 2006
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.192

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416
262-376-5170